HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

W.P.No.1282 of 1998

18-04-2007

Between:

Smt. K.Hemalatha

… Petitioner

and

The A.P.S.R.T.C.
rep. by its Managing Director,
Musheerabad, Hyderabad,
and another

… Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner : Ms. R.Dushyantala
for Sri V.Viswanatham

Counsel for respondents : Sri V.S.K.Rama Rao
for Sri V.T.M.Prasad

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed seeking a writ of mandamus to declare the action of respondents not appointing the petitioner as ticket booking agent in pursuance of letter dated 7-3-1995 issued by the office of the second respondent as wholly illegal, arbitrary and without justification and for consequential direction to respondents to appoint the petitioner as ticket booking agent for long distance bus services.

The first respondent issued a paper notification on 27-7-1994 calling upon the candidates for appointment of agents to sell tickets for long distance bus service on commission basis. The petitioner, responding to the said notification, applied for being appointed as an agent by paying Rs.200/- on 6-8-1994. Incidentally, the petitioner had been running STD/PCO centre near RTC Cross roads, Hyderabad. On 7-3-1995, office of the second respondent sent a letter to the petitioner wherein it was stated that the petitioner was provisionally selected as ticket booking agent on commission basis on the recommendation of the Committee for selling bus tickets for long distance service and the petitioner was invited through the said letter to enter into an agreement on 21-3-2005. The grievance of the petitioner is that subsequently by letter dated 15-3-1995 sent to the petitioner, the second respondent informed that the selection of ticket booking agents for selling the tickets to long distance bus service on commission basis, scheduled to be held on 21-3-1995, stands postponed on administrative grounds. The petitioner therefore filed this writ petition for the aforementioned relief.

Shri K.Vidyasagar Rao, Law Officer of the first respondent Corporation, filed counter-affidavit in which he admitted the provisional

selection of the petitioner for appointment as ticket booking agent. It is however stated in the counter-affidavit that after provisional selection of the petitioner, in view of the changes that have taken place in the strategy market, Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation felt it necessary to extend the system of ticket reservation facility to all services by increasing computer remote points throughout Hyderabad and Secunderabad and also around suburban areas and that therefore in view of the changed policy of the Corporation, the proposal for appointing individual ticket booking agents from among the provisionally selected candidates was dropped. It is further stated in the counter-affidavit that no private ticket booking agent was appointed in pursuance of the notification of the Corporation dated 27-7-1994.

The petitioner did not file any reply denying any of the aforementioned averments. Merely because the petitioner was provisionally selected, it does not create indefeasible right in her to insist that she should be appointed. The petitioner cannot contend that having taken a decision to appoint private agents for the purpose of booking tickets, the Corporation cannot later change its policy. The first respondent being a statutory Corporation is vested with the power to administer its affairs. It is always open to it to improve the system by introducing innovative methods, which are required for ever-changing needs of the passengers and the public. Therefore, in that process if the Corporation thought it fit to change its policy, the Corporation cannot be prevented from doing so and the petitioner has no vested right to insist that she should be appointed as private ticket agent merely because she was provisionally selected. As there is no denial by the petitioner that no private ticket agent was appointed in pursuance of the notification, in response to which the petitioner also applied and also got provisionally selected, it cannot be said that the Corporation's action is arbitrary or illegal.

For the aforementioned reasons, the writ petition is

dismissed. No costs.

_____

C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY, J

18-04-2007

bsc